DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 372 SO 012 850

AUTHOR Taft, Charles P.; Felknor, Bruce L.
TITLE Prejudice and Politics.
INSTITUTION B'nai B'rith, New York, N.Y. Anti-Defamation League.
PUB DATE 60
NOTE 57p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bias; Catholics; Civil Rights; Elections; Jews; *Politics; Protestants; Racial Bias; Religion; Religious Discrimination; *United States History

ABSTRACT

This monograph, written in 1960, examines the part prejudice played in politics throughout our national history. Part I of the monograph discusses "The Colonial Era." The immigrants that populated the new nation brought with them varied cultural heritages and different religious faiths. Soon the colonial pattern of religious prejudice reflected the bias prevalent in mother England. Catholics were severely disqualified in almost every colony. Jews received rights in some places and were debarred in others. The period from "The Revolution to the Civil War" was examined in Part II. The first organized effort to rally religious prejudice in an election campaign occurred in 1800 when the Federalists published a pamphlet addressed to "Religious Republicans" which suggested that Jefferson was anti-religious. During this time two anti-Catholic groups--the Native American Party and the Know-Nothings became quite active. Part III examines the "Civil War to World War I." In the Presidential campaign of 1860, Lincoln was subject to some of the worst vilification that has ever been heaped on any American politician. The Ku Klux Klan was formed in 1866. The next religious group to come under the guns of intolerance was the Mormons. "World War I to the Rise of Hitler" is the topic of Part IV. The World War effectively halted immigration to the United States, and never was it resumed on a pre-war scale. The crudest form of anti-Catholic bigotry played a major part against Smith in the 1928 Presidential campaign. The period from "The Rise of Hitler to the President" is examined in Part V. After 1930 the pattern of anti-Semitism in the United States changed. After Hitler came to power, the United States denounced his action toward the Jews with conviction. Bigotry continued to appear in politics. One example is the anti-Catholic campaign against Kennedy in 1960. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194372

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Stanley Wexler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PREJUDICE AND POLITICS

By CHARLES P. TAFT AND BRUCE L. FELKNOR

SP 012 850

Printed in the United States of America

Copyright—1960
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

First Printing 1960
Second Printing 1964

A NOTE

Research for this Freedom Pamphlet was begun by Paul Tobenkin who died in June of 1959. For twenty-five years, Mr. Tobenkin had been a reporter for the New York Herald Tribune, specializing in coverage of the problems of democracy. The Newspaper Guild, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and a group of civic agencies — as well as his friends and colleagues — have joined to establish the Paul Tobenkin Memorial Award Committee. Its purpose is to give recognition to writing well done — in the spirit of Paul Tobenkin — on the subject of the unending war against racial and religious bigotry and discrimination.

Additional research on "Prejudice and Politics" was done by Mrs. Lois Blume of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Freedom Pamphlets are published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	FOREWORD	5
	INTRODUCTION	7
I	THE COLONIAL ERA	10
II	THE REVOLUTION TO THE CIVIL WAR	16
III	CIVIL WAR TO WORLD WAR I	25
IV	WORLD WAR I TO THE RISE OF HITLER	34
V	THE RISE OF HITLER TO THE PRESENT	40
	Appendix A — THE ELEMENTS OF SMEAR	51
	Appendix B — CODE OF FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES	54
	Appendix C — BIBLIOGRAPHY	55

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Charles P. Taft, son of the 27th President of the United States, is a tax and trial lawyer in Cincinnati, where he is a long-time city councilman and former mayor. He is an authority on housing and municipal government. A leading Episcopalian, he was the first layman to be named president of the former Federal Council of Churches, and now is chairman of the Department of the Church and Economic Life of the National Council of Churches and of the Information Department of the World Council of Churches.

Mr. Taft was educated at the Taft School, Watertown, Conn., and at Yale University, where he was an outstanding athlete and graduated second in his class. Later at Yale Law School he was editor of the Yale Law Review. He is a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Twentieth Century Fund. He has served as president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, director of Wartime Economic Affairs and director of the State Department's Office of Transport and Communications Policy.

Mr. Taft was a founding member of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and has been its chairman since 1956.

Bruce L. Felknor is a nationally recognized authority on election campaign ethics and tactics. He has been executive director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee since 1956, coming to that post from a career as a newspaperman and public relations executive. He is active in political science circles and is a leader in civic and school affairs in the suburban New York community of Armonk.

Mr. Felknor attended the public schools of Oak Park and Bement, Illinois, and Menomonie, Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin. He is a ruling elder in the United Presbyterian Church, chairman of the Commission on Religion and Race of the Presbytery of Hudson River, and a member of the Commission on the Church and Civic and Political Life of the National Council of Churches.

FOREWORD

In 1960, when this pamphlet originally appeared, Henry Edward Schultz, then National Chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, wrote:

> While religious discrimination was . . . ruled out by law, [Article VI of the Constitution], it has continued to exist by tradition. Indeed, it has been tacitly understood that certain public offices were not "open" to certain religious persuasions or racial groups. The range of such offices has varied from time to time and place to place, but unfortunately the one constant has been the Presidency of the United States. Mr. Taft's and Mr. Felknor's review is therefore doubly important in a Presidential election year. . . .
>
> What is really involved is the integrity of the American political system. . . . This issue will be determined not by who wins but by how we conduct ourselves during the contest. . . .

In 1964, another Presidential election will be held. The "unwritten law" that only a Protestant can be President of the United States is no longer a constant. The election of John F. Kennedy was an affirmation of the spirit of the Constitutional provision that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust of the United States." And the refusal of Richard Nixon, his Republican opponent, to project religion as an issue in the campaign for this nation's highest position of public responsibility has also established an honorable precedent for the conduct of candidates and electorate, alike.

Yet, America cannot allow this shining victory over ignorance and intolerance to obscure the tenacious evil of prejudice in politics. In many cities, counties and states throughout the country, able public servants have been subjected to libel and slander, and categorically rejected, not on the basis of any platform or policy, but as a result of the exploitation of racial and religious bigotry.

Education and participation in the political process are the only effective weapons with which well-meaning American voters can combat discrimination against members of minority groups.

The citizen must learn to question rumors, stereotypes, and inflammatory statements. He must read and reread newspapers and books in order to grasp the enormity of his potential influence on local, state and national politics. Until the average voter appreciates the privilege of his single vote and understands the responsibility that goes with it, he cannot comprehend the extent to which his government is as good or as bad as he makes it.

If our equalitarian tradition is to be maintained and strengthened, it is the duty of each American in our pluraiistic democracy to see that racial or religious prejudice shall not bar any qualified individual from a position of public trust.

Irresponsible office-seekers who are rejected at the polls will see the necessity and wisdom of behaving responsibly, and then, eventually, our Constitutional ideal will have been fully and glowingly realized.

DORE SCHARY
National Chairman,
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

INTRODUCTION

What part does prejudice play in politics? How should Americans of good will react to the use of prejudice in our political process? When is prejudice rallied deliberately and when is it harnessed unintentionally?

Rarely does an election campaign pass without raising these questions in the minds of some of our fellow-citizens. If we would find the answers to them we must examine the history of prejudice and politics in the United States. And to do this we must go back to colonial days and trace the growth of America — from the earliest colonization at the dawn of the seventeenth century through the massive immigrations of the late eighteenth century up to the present.

Oscar Handlin, the historian, begins a classic study of immigration this way: "Once I thought to write a history of the immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants *were* American history." In the three and a half centuries since this land was first colonized, people of every national and ethnic background on earth have settled here.

The immigrants that populated a new nation brought with them richly varied cultural heritages. While each group clung to its own cultural background, the catalysts of freedom and opportunity enabled them to contribute something of their Old World culture to our own peculiar and wonderful heritage — gradually blending a thousand olds into a new — an American heritage that is one and yet varied, similar but not uniform.

Today most Americans take pride in the diversity of our land and of our people. In many ways we live in a harmony that is unique in the world. But conflicts, misunderstandings, apprehensions still strike occasional discords; these discords are perhaps less surprising than they are disappointing.

The immigrants also brought with them different religious

faiths, and these they were not prepared to cast into any melting pot. These faiths have survived and flourished.

As Americans have become somewhat the same, they still have remained somewhat different from one another. Today we exist in what sociologists call a pluralistic society. One of the ways in which we are the same is that we cherish our right to be different from each other. So, in our pluralistic society, Protestants, Catholics, Jews and agnostics exist side-by-side in relative amity and mutual trust.

With much justification, Americans feel that intergroup relations in the United States are the best in the world. Our society flourishes with only an occasional eruption of bitterness and bigotry. When they do occur, these eruptions of racial or religious prejudice cause deep concern, and wide-scale efforts are made to control them and to prevent their recurrence. While no man of good will can be complacent about the state of the Negro in much of our land, we can say with honesty, however, that many of us are facing the problem and that we are making progress, however belatedly or slowly.

Prejudice flaring up among the main groups comprising our society is especially evident in an election year. In some campaigns, appeals to prejudice are raised deliberately and maliciously. In others, prejudice is aroused accidentally. In either case, to control it we must understand it. And to understand it we must examine the course of prejudice and politics throughout our national history. For prejudice and politics, and the interaction between them, has been a major factor on this soil since the earliest settlements.

The first expressions of prejudice on the American political scene were quite fundamental. The law simply deprived certain groups of any civil rights. As we will see, after reviewing ten generations of history on American soil, the means of expressing prejudice have altered greatly. Not only does the denial of rights to minorities no longer have the sanction of law, it is clearly against the law. Let us examine this changing pattern from its start.

Superficially it seems ironic that the early colonists of New England, who came here seeking religious freedom, are remembered to this day for their bigotry toward religious non-conformists in their own community. A closer look is in order to resolve this seeming paradox.

American colonization got its first major impetus from the failure of intergroup relations in the Old World.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt addressed a meeting of the Daughters of the American Revolution as "Fellow Immigrants," these two words served as a humorous comment on and contrast between the proprietary attitude toward America's history and future sometimes displayed by these ladies, and the obvious fact that every non-Indian American either is an immigrant or is descended from immigrants. With almost equal truth, the late President might have saluted the DAR as "fellow minorities." For most of America's first settlers were immigrants because they were members of minority religious bodies which found it necessary to cross the Atlantic to escape from religious persecution.

Moreover, early migration within this land, which led to the establishment of other new colonies here, resulted from the home-grown persecution of one group toward another. Anglicans drove Puritans out of England. The Puritans drove the Baptists out of Massachusetts Bay. Catholics and Protestants vied for control of Maryland. And throughout the colonies other Christian groups temporarily ignored the differences among them in order to concentrate on harassing Quakers and Unitarians.

In early colonial days, Christian-Jewish relations posed no great problem, for there were very few Jews in the colonies. Large-scale Jewish immigration was far off in the future. But when the first small band of Jews did arrive in America, in 1654, they came very much in the Yankee pattern—fleeing persecution.

Literally, such unity as our nation enjoys today has grown directly from disunity, and often violent disunity at that.

I

THE COLONIAL ERA

Eleven of the thirteen original colonies were first settled by English subjects. And seven of these eleven were established before Oliver Cromwell and the Puritan rebellion in England had forcibly introduced the doctrine of separation of church and state (under the name of disestablishmentarianism—that ancient bugaboo of youthful spelling bee contestants).

So, being subjects of a crown which supported an established church, the colonists, too, created established churches of their own as a matter of course. In Virginia, where the motive for colonization was expansion of the empire rather than religious dissidence, it was natural that the Church of England be transplanted to the soil of the New World. But in New England it was automatic that the faith to be established was that of the Puritans.

When the Mayflower anchored off Cape Cod, its Pilgrim passengers disembarked, "Saints" and a surprising number of "strangers," gave thanks to God and set out to hew a stronghold in the cold soil of their new land. The civil government they fashioned, based on the Mayflower Compact which they signed before debarking, was simple in operation and related to the faith of the controlling religious leaders which was intense. The principles of their church were applied to the government of their small colony. Probably because it did not occur to them to do so, the Plymouth Pilgrims made no attempt to delimit rights of citizenship. There was no religious conflict among them. They shared a common plight in their valiant effort to survive their first winter together. All members of the band, sixty-odd of whom lived through the winter, enjoyed the rights of free men.

But within the decade other groups immigrated to Massachusetts Bay and the colony's population grew. Among the newcomers were many more non-conformists. A more comprehensive body of law was needed. The Massachusetts Bay Charter of 1629

established a theocratic state, based rigidly on biblical principles, with rights specifically reserved to members of the established (Puritan) faith.

In the stern framework of this Bible-oriented colony, religious dissent was tantamount to treason. Yet dissenters appeared and spoke their minds. The Massachusetts General Court of 1631 reinforced the reservation of civic rights to church members. By 1634 the number of non-conformists had increased to a point at which some *rapprochement* was necessary. The solution adopted was to establish civil control over freemen. Non-conformists were gradually accorded that status, thus releasing them from direct jurisdiction of a religious faith they did not accept. But active dissent, and the propagation of unestablished doctrine was still intolerable to the theocratic colony.

Roger Williams, a convert to Puritanism, but a believer in individual freedom, refused to conform his conscience to the Puritan mold and was expelled from Massachusetts. With a handful of followers he made his way southward and established the colony of Rhode Island, bringing to full cycle the pattern of dissent, persecution and flight which had led the Pilgrims to the New World. The Rhode Island colony was founded on a covenant providing strict separation of church and state, and became the first such colony on American soil to grant complete religious tolerance to its residents. Williams founded the first Baptist church on American soil in Providence in 1638. Rhode Island was later to become a haven for Quakers and, still later, Jews.

Except for Rhode Island, the Massachusetts Bay pattern persisted throughout New England. Dissenters were free only to keep quiet or to flee. However, by 1641 the attitude of Massachusetts toward dissenting Protestants was modified still further. In that year the adoption of a "Body of Liberties" allowed the formation of diverse Protestant churches and protected them from persecution. Refugees were welcomed to the colony, and the ecclesiastical authority yielded to a civil government the right and duty to maintain the peace, to see that Christian practice was observed in church, and to compel public attendance at church. A religious test was essential for public office. Within Massachusetts this pattern did not change until the Revolution. Things were somewhat better in neighboring Connecticut.

In its Fundamental Orders of 1639, Connecticut applied the Puritan principle of a church covenant governing civil affairs.

But aside from stipulating that the governor must be a member of an approved congregation, no religious test for office was necessary and office holders were not required to take a religious oath. The Fundamental Orders spelled out toleration of all churches that taught the gospel of Jesus Christ, and all freemen had the right to vote and to hold office. A colonial charter in 1682 guaranteed to citizens all the rights of Englishmen.

Meanwhile, in Maryland, a group quite different from the Plymouth Pilgrims was founding a new colony for the same reason: freedom to worship as its members saw fit.

Haven for English Catholics

In 1625, a year before Peter Minuit bought Manhattan Island from the Indians, George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore and secretary of state to King James I, converted to Catholicism. Catholic-Protestant unrest in the island kingdom had been festering since Henry VIII had broken with Rome, fired his prime minister, Cardinal Wolsey, and divorced his devout Catholic wife, Catherine of Aragon, to marry Anne Boleyn. The situation had been further aggravated by the brief and bloody reign of Henry's Catholic daughter, Mary Tudor, when Catholic rights were restored and Protestants became the scapegoats. When "Bloody Mary" was succeeded by her Protestant half-sister, Elizabeth I, the onus again fell on English Catholics. They were deprived of civil rights and forced under penalty of fine to attend Anglican religious services, which their own faith strictly forbade.

From this context it is apparent that Lord Baltimore could hardly retain his high post as secretary of state after his conversion to Catholicism. Despite the fact that King James I was a Catholic, and while the first glimmerings of English religious tolerance were shining tentatively in Britain, an increasingly hostile Parliament would have none of any show of mercy toward the hated Papists. Baltimore resigned, but not before conceiving the idea of a haven for English Catholics in the New World. George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, died in 1632 but in the same year a crown charter for the colony of Maryland was granted to his son, Leonard, the second Lord Baltimore. Leonard Calvert led a small contingent of Catholics (with a few Protestants) to America, and founded the colony of Maryland in 1634.

From its start, Maryland was a high point of religious liberty

in the history of the young country. The charter, emanating as it did from the English throne, permitted the establishment of the Church of England, although it did not require it. But the government of this new colony, tolerant as it was toward other Christian groups, still would brook no anti-Christian conduct. In fact, as Gustavus Meyers has observed in his "History of Bigotry," early Maryland acts prohibiting blasphemy were quite the equivalent of similar Puritan enactments in New England. The colony also refused to tolerate any *agitation* directed at the tenets of the Catholic faith of its founders.

A Maryland legislative enactment of 1649, known as the Toleration Act, was passed under colonial Catholic auspices providing that no persons "professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be any ways troubled . . . in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof."

In fact, the only prosecution permitted in the Maryland colony on religious grounds was against people seeking to impose religious conformity on their neighbors. The governor and colonial council were required to take an oath that they would observe and uphold religious toleration.

Partly due to the tolerance of the dominant Catholics, Maryland's population swelled with subsequent immigrations from England and from neighboring Virginia. Soon the populace was more than 70 per cent Protestant and a struggle for control began. A Protestant-dominated assembly disqualified Catholics from civil rights. Later, the reins over the colony were restored to Lord Baltimore, and still later, by James II, once again to the Protestants. Relative toleration remained the order of the day, however, and Presbyterians, Anabaptists and even Quakers, to whom few doors in the New World were open, flourished in Maryland. Only Jews and Unitarians were disqualified, and the Blasphemy Act provided fines and imprisonment for "the religious reproaching of all but Jews."

Other influences joined the slowly swelling stream of religious freedom in the new land. New York had been founded by the Dutch, who although more tolerant of Jews than most Europeans of the day, displayed a strong bias against Catholics. The Spanish Inquisition had driven the Sephardic Jews out of the Spanish Peninsula. Many of them had fled to Brazil while that South American territory was under Dutch rule. When the Portuguese took over Brazil, a small company of Jews left that

land for New Amsterdam, arriving 23 strong in 1654. The Dutch governor, Peter Stuyvesant, at first sought to expel them; however, the West India Company, which held the colony charter, better reflected the relative tolerance of their original homeland and permitted the Jews to stay. A generation later the British had taken over and a 1691 declaration of rights provided liberty of conscience for all — except for "any persons of the Romanish Religion."

Throughout the study of prejudice and its application to American political rights, it becomes apparent that the influence of Europe lies not far beneath the surface of acts and practices in the colonies and even later in the United States. The Dutch were relatively benign toward Jews, but along with the English hated the Catholics. And so went the pattern in New Amsterdam and, subsequently, New York.

Starting in 1681, Pennsylvania began to forge its contributions to liberty in a new land, William Penn, an English Quaker, was imprisoned for his beliefs. But because the English crown owed him a large sum of money, instead of languishing in prison he was permitted to emigrate to America. In 1681 Penn received a charter for the Pennsylvania colony.

Penn, as a Quaker and thus subject to persecution at every hand, was particularly conscious of the issue of religious liberty. When the Frame of Government for Pennsylvania was drawn up a year after the charter, it was modeled closely on the outstanding example of Rhode Island. Liberty of conscience was guaranteed for all. No religion was established or favored. The far-reaching provisions of the Frame of Government were reaffirmed in Penn's 1701 Charter of Privilege. And these stood unabridged through the Revolutionary era.

Similarly, New Jersey modeled its colonial government after the Rhode Island pattern, guaranteeing liberty of conscience and establishing no one religion. And, at about the same time, New Hampshire declared liberty of conscience after the later Massachusetts fashion — that is, for all Protestants.

Meanwhile, in the South, the first English settlement had flourished in Virginia, guaranteeing at the outset in 1606 English civil rights to all Englishmen who were transported to its shores. In 1618 the Cavalier Commonwealth promulgated an ordinance propagating the Christian Religion to all infidels and natives, and extending to all, including even indentured servants, the

right of suffrage. The air of the colonies was relatively free of supervision by the crown, and this unheard-of state of affairs in Virginia continued until 1670 when suffrage rights in the colony were limited to those which prevailed in England.

There had been an early Jewish settlement in South Carolina, and although Jews were not guaranteed any liberties or rights in early colonial days, in practice they simply exercised those rights until they were specifically disqualified in 1721. South Carolina granted its people all the rights of Englishmen from the earliest days. Next door, in North Carolina, liberty went a bit further, and in 1663 this colony emulated the Rhode Island charter by granting liberty of conscience to all.

After the turn of the 18th century there were few advances in freedom of conscience until the American Revolution, and there were one or two setbacks. Rhode Island, in 1719, excluded Catholics from the right to hold public office, and in Georgia, in 1732, the charter granted freedom of religion to all — except Papists.

Here, then, was the colonial pattern. Reflecting the dominant theme in mother England, Catholics were severely disqualified in almost every colony. Jews received rights in some places, were debarred in others. Where they were given citizenship, it was often, as for a time in South Carolina, almost inadvertent. Elsewhere such toleration reflected patterns "back home," as in the case of the Dutch in New York. And everywhere such privileges were granted to Jews, an important factor was their small number in the population. As the colonial period drew to a close on the eve of the Revolution, it is doubtful that in all the colonies there lived more than 2,000 Jews.

Aside from the almost universally disfranchised Catholics, the prime targets everywhere were Quakers, Unitarians and — worse — Freethinkers. Meyers summarizes it this way: "Engaged in contention among themselves, the various Protestant sects in the American colonies sought in common the suppression of Catholics; and Protestants and Catholics alike desired the elimination of Freethinkers."

From this welter of discord, however, was beginning to emerge the first intimation of a harmony among different and antagonistic groups that would in the end ring in mankind's ear longer than the shot heard 'round the world — which was about to be fired, aptly enough, at Concord.

II

THE REVOLUTION TO THE CIVIL WAR

Organized bigotry had not yet emerged on the American scene as the colonial era gave way to the war for independence. And the spontaneous and unrehearsed variety of religious prejudice that had flourished quickly dwindled in the face of the ambitious and audacious American effort to drive mighty England — earth's number one power — out of the New World.

How Jews and Quakers and Catholics must have received news of the Declaration of Independence!

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, *that all men are created equal,* that they are endowed by their creator with certain *unalienable rights,* that among these are *life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness . . .*" Who was the "we" of the Declaration? The authorized spokesmen for the colonies, including the most estimable and honorable men of the future nation.

"And for the support of this Declaration," the unprecedented document concluded, ". . . we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Not "for the support of rebellion from the crown." Not "for the liberty of Protestants," but for the Declaration in toto.

Virtually all of the still tiny number of Jews in America responded with fervor to the call to arms. A very few, like a number of Protestants, continued to count themselves loyal subjects to George III, and remained here as Tories. For most, however, the cause was clear. Despite the political proscriptions that continued to dog them in most of the colonial territory, nowhere in Europe had Jews achieved the degree of freedom and equality and opportunity they found here.

The Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania (there were few elsewhere) supported the war effort overwhelmingly. Indians from the North who had been converted to Catholicism by Jesuit missionaries fought side-by-side with Yankee farmers. Catholic

officers from Ireland, France and Poland came as volunteers to aid the Rebel cause. Maryland's Charles Carroll, a Catholic, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

The other principal persecuted group — the Quakers — fared much less well. Conscientious objectors on a doctrinal basis, they could not participate in military actions. They were fined in lieu of service. In some instances they were baited by their neighbors. A Quaker would be elected to some local office whose war-engendered responsibilities it was known he could not conscientiously accept. Upon declining the office, the Quaker involved would then be fined for non-compliance.

Some Quakers concurred with James Logan that a war of defense was Christian and justifiable, and so supported the effort. More strict constructionists of George Fox's admonitions against involvement in rebellions and other troubles expelled many of these supporters of the Revolution from their monthly meetings. This led to the establishment of so-called Free Quaker meetings, of one of which Betsy Ross was a member.

Meanwhile, the future of liberty grew somewhat brighter. Virginia in 1776 proclaimed a new Bill of Rights which was to set the pattern for the nation and ultimately for all sister states. Mincing no words, it declared that "all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience."

The war drew to an end when the British cabinet recognized American independence and the period of the Confederation culminated in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. While all the new state constitutions somewhat improved the lot of second-class citizens, only Virginia and New York granted unabridged rights to all. But the spark of religious freedom struck by Madison, Jefferson, and George Mason in the Virginia Bill of Rights had caught fire. The restrictions (". . . except for Jews"; ". . . except members of the Romanish Religious,") were on the wane. An early evidence was in the Constitution, which emerged from the Philadelphia Convention after four months of deliberation and drafting, and which took effect when New Hampshire became the ninth state to ratify it less than nine months after its completion.

Article VI dealt with oaths of office and provided that "affirmation to support this Constitution" would be as acceptable as a religious oath. The article concluded: "but no religious test shall

ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Ironically (until the Presidency of John F. Kennedy), some Americans, reserving their own right to untrammeled freedom under every article of the Constitution, still were unable to accept the wording and unmistakable intent of this article. While it prevailed, the scandalous "unwritten law" that only a Protestant Christian could be President of the United States in effect inserted into the Constitution one of the evils that document was created to strike down. It did so by reading into the constitutional prohibition of a religious test the familiar and bigoted phrase, "except for Jews and members of the Romanish religion."

The Bill of Rights went a step further to spell out the new freedoms in detail. Indeed the first sentence of the First Amendment enunciated a genuine freedom of religion: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Now at last Jews and Catholics had won equal rights in the supreme law of the land. The triumph of the most responsible brand of politics over prejudice was at hand.

Now any new state admitted to the Union would come in with a constitution guaranteeing political and religious rights to all its citizens. For Article IV of the Constitution specified that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." The patterns that existed in New York and Virginia began to spread among the other former colonies. By 1790 — two years after adoption of the Constitution — Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Georgia had removed restrictions on Jews. (And most of the Jewish population was concentrated in those states.)

Yet the lingering restrictions in the other original states were long in dying. Those of New Hampshire were most stringent and the last to pass; in 1876 the provision that the governor must be a Protestant was scrapped at last.

Bigotry and Elections

The dawn of the 19th Century saw the first organized effort to rally religious prejudice in an election campaign.

In 1800 the influence of the Federalist Party was about to wane. Thomas Jefferson was seeking the Presidency as a member

of the new Democratic-Republican Party. The Federalists, who were dismayed at the prospect of an increasing democratic voice in the affairs of government and alarmed at the prospect that Jefferson might win the helm of the nation in this still-formative period, opposed him diligently. They published a pamphlet addressed to "Religious Republicans" and sought to raise their hackles by suggesting that Jefferson was anti-religious. The pamphlet was keyed to a charge that Jefferson had said, while looking at a church building in ruins, "It is good enough for Him that was born in a manger."

Studies of the effectiveness of political smears were still a century and a half in the future, and it is difficult to assess the effects of this one, but Jefferson won a tie in electoral votes and was named third President of the United States in the House of Representatives.

The War of 1812 was mismanaged by both sides. Before the British finally outfumbled the United States, the American government was virtually bankrupt. The national capital had been burned by the British, and the Federalist Party, out of power since 1800, was frustrated and angry. Fearful of democracy, deeply disturbed at the increasing political power of the common people, distressed by the spreading franchise of Jews and Catholics, the Party conducted its 1815 Convention in Hartford, Conn., since Washington was in ashes.

The remedy proposed by the Convention was a Constitutional amendment making naturalized citizens ineligible to serve in Congress. This amendment demonstrated how far the Federalists were out of touch with the people, for the Hartford Convention proved, in practical terms, to be the burial service for the Federalist Party. Nothing came of the proposal. But not far in the future, out of these roots of mistrust of the foreign-born was to grow a more mischievous stalk of bigotry.

Meanwhile, restrictions against Jews and Catholics continued to disappear, one by one. In Maryland, William Pinckney presented a bill in the legislature which would eliminate the last restrictions against Jews in civil life. In the General Assembly, when the bill first came up, a young Scottish-born disciple of Jefferson and Monroe, one Thomas Kennedy, fought hard for the bill. "There are no Jews in the country from which I come, nor have I the slightest acquaintance with any Jew in the world," he told his fellow-legislators. "There are a few in

the United States; and in Maryland there are very few, but if there were only one, to that one we ought to do justice."

The bill failed to pass the first time around, although 40 members of the legislature supported it. The effort inflamed Marylanders who were not ready to give equal rights to the Jews, and sixteen of the 40 who had voted for the bill were defeated in the next legislative election, including Kennedy, who was defeated a second time in 1823. But in 1825, Kennedy, thoroughly aroused, based his campaign for the General Assembly on his support of the "Jew Bill," won election, and proceeded to shepherd the bill through the two legislative sessions required. It became law in 1826, finally enfranchising Maryland Jews.

Now prejudice in politics was ready to come onto the national stage and on a national scale. Its target was somewhat unexpected: Freemasonry. In France an anti-Masonic movement had been founded upon the false assertion that this secret order had instigated the French revolution. The Masons were indeed a secret order, and as to their political power — here at home — had not Washington, Franklin, John Marshall all been Masons? So was Andrew Jackson, hero of the War of 1812 and rocketing now into national political prominence. To anti-Jacksonians, who would go far to keep Old Hickory out of the White House, fear of Masonry might be an ally.

Ministers of various Protestant denominations tended to resent the Masons because while the order had religious overtones it had no affiliation with any one church. And many ministers believed Masonic influence had helped impose political restrictions on the clergy. So the slowly spreading anti-Masonic movement to these men seemed a possible comeback route.

Just at that moment, one William Morgan, of Batavia, New York, was abducted and disappeared from sight. Morgan was a Mason, and he was preparing a book purporting to reveal the secrets of Freemasonry. The ensuing investigation and excitement got the anti-Masonic ball rolling. In 1830 the Anti-Mason Party made political history by conducting the young nation's first national political convention, with some 96 delegates from ten states. The movement was briefly an important factor in northern and eastern politics, and its Presidential candidate managed to win the electoral vote of Vermont in 1832. This unimpressive performance sped the demise of the anti-Masons as a political entity, but not before they had demonstrated the facility

with which a dedicated organization of "anti's" can rally public support.

The next American venture into political prejudice was to wreak infinitely greater mischief before it subsided. And as will be seen, it flares up spasmodically to this day.

The Nativist Movement

Samuel F. B. Morse was an upright Puritan artist and inventor. In 1830 he made a grand tour of Europe and stood one day in Rome watching a papal procession. As the Pope passed, Morse's hat was struck forcibly from his head by a soldier, or, as the inventor put it in his diary, "by a poltroon in a soldier's costume." Instead of viewing the incident as an offense of a loutish soldier, Morse concluded it was due to "base and indiscriminate orders" from the papal system. The episode converted Morse's staunch Yankee Puritanism to a fanatic anti-Catholic zeal. On his return home, in Ray Allen Billington's words, "Morse hurried into print to warn his countrymen of the insidious papal designs on the United States."

At this time, Irish immigrants were flooding into the United States. The Irish — virtually all Catholics — quickly became the butt of Morse's agitation. And the fact that the Irish were foreigners led to a developing resentment of all foreign immigrants. Residual Puritan antagonism to Romanism fed on continuing anti-Catholicism within England and on American mistrust of Britain's Catholic neighbors, France and Spain. As Catholics continued to receive political rights in more and more states the concern of Americans who feared the papacy heightened. There was a widespread and growing belief that sinister foreign influence threatened to infiltrate the United States and drain its life blood. The Catholic church was organized along authoritarian lines — quite undemocratically. The influx of Catholics was held to be clearly a plot by the Pope to gain numerical superiority in America and then to take over.

Morse's alarming essays found ready readers. In 1834 a Catholic convent in Boston was burned to the ground by a mob spurred by deliberate lies about conditions within the place. By the following year a national movement directed at all foreign born and with particular emphasis on Catholics was clearly in the offing. The Morse essays were collected under these titles: "Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States,"

and "Imminent Dangers to the Free Institutions of the United States Through Foreign Immigration." In 1836 a lurid and sensational book, falsely purporting to be disclosures of awful facts about the Catholic Church, came from the pen of a demented Canadian-born girl named Maria Monk. Titled, "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," the volume pretended to be the autobiography of a nun, which Maria never was. Billington describes the book as "from that day to this a best-selling tribute to the gullibility of book-buying nativists."

Between Morse and Monk and other nativist figures like Horace Bushnell, who urged Americans to protect their "noble Saxon blood" against the tide of immigrants, it was a bad time for the foreign-born — especially Catholics. At this point in New York City a nativist candidate polled some 40 per cent of the vote in a minor election. Here indeed was a banner to which the bitter, the frustrated, the suspicious and the narrow could repair. Malevolence flourished.

The Native American Party emerged as a political entity. Adapting the last futile notion of the Federalists, the Party stood on a platform of raising naturalization requirements from five to 21 years, and of excluding all foreigners from political office.

By 1841 the focus of the Native Americans was purely anti-Catholic. For a time the movement successfully infiltrated the Society of St. Tammany in New York.

At this stage the Catholics were seeking to establish parochial schools on a wide scale. One of the reasons for this move was that they despaired of rooting specific anti-Catholic material out of public school texts, some of which went so far as to be reminiscent of the notorious New England Primer of colonial days. One lesson page began, "Child, behold that man of sin, the pope, worthy of thy utmost hatred." Catholic children in public schools were required to read the Protestant Bible, sing Protestant hymns, repeat Protestant prayers, and were punished if, in accord with their consciences, they refused to do so. The Catholic bishops besought the state to turn over to Catholic schools that portion of school tax money received from Catholic parents in order that Catholic children could be educated in their own schools and the Protestant children could continue in their Protestant-oriented education in the public schools. But the proposal, as well as being rejected, simply fed

the flames of anti-Catholic feeling. Overzealous Catholic priests worsened the situation by viewing the steady flow of Catholic immigrants as evidence that they soon would enjoy numerical superiority.

An "American Republican Party" emerged and endorsed Henry Clay in 1844. Polk won the election. In the same year Millard Fillmore was defeated for governor of New York. Defeated, he said, as was Clay, by "abolitionists and foreign Catholics." Nativist-inspired rioting in Philadelphia grew so serious it had to be quelled by armed troops. Two Catholic churches were burned before the insurrection was put down. Pennsylvania remained the last stronghold of the Native American Party, and here it flourished for years after it had left the wider scene.

The Know-Nothings

The party actually gave way to another burgeoning anti-Catholic group secretly formed in New York in 1849 as "The Grand Council of the United States of North America." Retaining its clandestine character, the group grew in scope and membership and its members gradually became identified as "the Know-Nothings," because when queried about the nature and aims of the organization they invariably replied, "I know nothing about it." The formal name of the group was changed in 1854 to the "Grand Council of the Supreme Star Spangled Banner." Its popular identification did not change, nor did its anti-Catholic zeal flag. The movement spread like wildfire. Its propaganda was reinforced by such eminently respectable Protestant organizations as the American Bible Society, whose publishing facilities were devoted to anti-Popery.

By 1855 the Know-Nothings were organized in every state and territory, had elected governors in seven states, controlled the legislatures of five states through members or allies, and counted more than 100 members or allies in Congress.

But while the national orgy of anti-Catholicism was reaching its crest, its excesses and its blunders were preparing its end. Responsible citizens grew increasingly disgusted by the character of the attacks on Catholics. Legislative control, for practical purposes, came to nought because of idiotic moves like that of the Massachusetts legislature which appointed a Nunnery Committee to go poking about convents and church basements in search of hidden arms to support the ludicrous prospect of a papal inva-

sion. Fantastic ventures of this sort added ridicule to the arsenal of the slowly growing forces of reason. And finally, the Know-Nothings were "straddled" over the increasingly important question of slavery. The rocky issue of involuntary servitude, together with public outrage and ridicule, was too much, and the Know-Nothings quickly slid from their peak in 1855 to a richly deserved demise before the end of that year.

While public attention had been dominated by the Know-Nothing frenzy, another group of immigrants had begun a steady flow into ever-expanding America. A massive influx of Germans had begun in the 1820's and it extended over a half century. In this stream, whose high point was probably 1848, were many Jews. As the wave began, the Jewish population may have equalled 5,000 out of a total of some 13 million Americans. Yet in the 50-year tide of German immigration probably 300,000 Jews were to begin the process of becoming Americans.

Nativists paid scant heed to the Jews during the Know-Nothing era. They regarded them as foreigners, and opposed their entry on that score, but they were unrelated to the hated pope, and thus clearly the lesser of two evils. Anti-Semitism had not come into existence on any appreciable scale in the United States. The German Jews were regarded as Germans, just as German as the Lutherans who came with them.

So on the eve of the Civil War, the American Jewish community, long disadvantaged in civil terms during colonial days, at last found itself with full citizenship privileges for those born here and equal opportunity for naturalization of the newcomers. Quickly and happily, the newcomers adopted American ways — so rapidly indeed, that some of their own elders feared the total disappearance of Jewish traditions among American Jews.

In the face of persecution and vilification of a bitterness and vehemence that today is difficult to conceive, the Catholics had managed to flourish with their citizenship legally guaranteed.

And a new object of prejudice in politics was about to appear.

III

CIVIL WAR TO WORLD WAR I

In his Presidential campaign in 1860, Abraham Lincoln was subject to some of the worst vilification that has ever been heaped on any American politician. His physical appearance was the subject of scurrilous caricature depicting him as a simian. One favored epithet of the Lincoln haters was "that obscene ape from Illinois." He was called a Negro and a mulatto in efforts to discredit his opposition to slavery, and a monster, idiot and buffoon to impugn his intelligence. After his election he received a threat that he would be killed if he came to the capital to take office.

The Know-Nothing era having dissipated, its very memory now unfashionable, his opponents accused him of having secretly attended meetings of that extremist group. Actually, Lincoln had indignantly rejected a nativist bid to endorse him for the Illinois Assembly in 1854. And he had eloquently expressed his belief that foreign immigration offered a boon to the United States as well as a haven to refugees from European oppression.

When war came, the earlier targets of oppression were largely forgotten as scapegoats in the rush to prosecute the hostilities between North and South. Prejudice lingered here and there. Some Jews had become merchants and manufacturers of clothing and so were selling uniforms and other material to the Army. It was inevitable, probably, that there should be some accusations of war profiteering directed at the Jews.

At one point, in 1862, General Grant expelled Jews from his military jurisdiction. It took some three weeks for this news to reach the President. When he learned of it, he rescinded the action at once.

The Jews, who had themselves immigrated to the United States to escape persecution abroad, were overwhelmingly opposed to slavery. Nonetheless, some of the Jews residing in the South reacted much as did their Christian neighbors. Thus Judah Benjamin, a leading Louisiana lawyer, became an eloquent

spokesman for the Confederate cause, and actually served as secretary of state in the Confederate cabinet of Jefferson Davis.

A burning need for additional labor in war plants sparked the passage near the end of the war of the contract labor law in the North, which permitted manufacturers to contract with European would-be immigrants, so as to agree on wages and pay for their passage to the United States. Thus immigration served a purpose useful to the war, and this fact contributed to the general war-born lessening of anti-foreign feeling.

In the Presidential campaign of 1864 there came one of the earliest references to "bloc voting," meaning a solid or nearly solid vote of an ethnic or other group. A Jewish chiropodist and friend of the President, Isachar Zacharie, assured him that "the Israelites" would support him solidly. Actually, while prior to the Civil War the Jews had gravitated toward the Democratic Party as far more friendly to the foreign-born, the slavery issue and Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation shifted much of the Jewish vote to the Republican Party.

It was the Emancipation Proclamation, by which Lincoln, on New Year's Day of 1863, declared the slaves thenceforth to be free, that projected a new current into the maelstrom of prejudice and politics.

With the war's end came the grievous problem of reconstruction, including the enfranchisement of Negroes. The troubled times were rendered more so by the murder of the President. Aside from the loss of his hand at the helm at this crucial moment, Lincoln's assassination projected into the White House Vice-President Andrew Johnson, a Democrat who had been drafted to run with Lincoln in 1864 on a National Union ticket in hopes of winning Democratic support. Conflict between the President and Congress began immediately. Johnson offered amnesty to Confederates if they would ratify the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery. The southern states did so but hedged by enacting the so-called Black Codes creating special punishments for Negroes convicted of crimes, and binding former slaves to their one-time masters so as virtually to continue the effect of slavery. The Congress, enraged at these obstructions by the South, passed a civil rights bill in 1865 which specified that every person born in or naturalized in the United States (except Indians) was a citizen of the nation and of his state. Johnson vetoed the bill and Congress immediately passed it over his veto. Then the Congress

enacted the Freedmen's Bureau Bill which provided for trial by military court-martial of anyone interfering with the new rights of Negroes. Again Johnson vetoed the measure, and again it was passed despite him. A dispute arose over the constitutionality of the 1865 Civil Rights Bill and Congress proposed the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, which was finally ratified in 1868.

The Negro now was a full-fledged political issue.

He also was a political participant, although this fact was not greeted with unbridled pleasure even in the North. At the time the 14th Amendment became effective, Negroes actually had the right to vote in only two northern states outside long-abolitionist New England.

In the South, military occupation had seen to the initial enfranchisement of the former slaves. Many of them were elected to southern legislatures and several to the Congress from their states.

Actually, even in the states where Negroes were in the majority, they never did dominate their legislatures during the Reconstruction. Always the whites contrived to be in a position to block key Negro moves. In the 30-year period beginning in 1870 the entire South only sent 20 Negro Congressmen and two United States Senators to Washington. (Both of the Senators were from Mississippi.)

But the very fact of Negro representation in the legislatures and in the Congress sparked two developments that profoundly affected the course of the Reconstruction. One was the enactment by southern legislatures of various devices to prevent the Negro from the full exercise of his franchise. The other was the emergence of the Ku Klux Klan.

From this era stemmed poll taxes, which most Negroes could not afford to pay in order to vote, Grandfather Clauses which barred former slaves by permitting the vote only to those whose grandfathers had used it, special literacy tests (only given to Negroes because they were so difficult most whites could not pass them) and similar measures.

Emergence of the Klan

The Klan was formed in 1866 when the South saw the direction that Reconstruction was going to take. An early leader was

the Confederate cavalry hero, General Nathan Bedford Forrest, who left little doubt as to the objective of the group. "The Klan," he said, "is a protective, political, military organization. I am opposed to Negro suffrage under any and all circumstances." Violence was a hallmark of Klan activity. In Louisiana alone, it is estimated that violence at the hands of Klansmen left more than 2,000 dead.

Stetson Kennedy in his "Southern Exposure" describes the election of 1876 in the South, in which the Klan played a bloody role:

"The election of 1876 was recognized by all factions as the showdown. Democrats openly threatened that they 'would carry the election or kill the last damned Republican in the South.' The Klan brought its intensive campaign of terrorism to a whirlwind climax. Shipments of arms hurriedly dispatched to military units were confiscated by Klansmen who had been tipped off by railroad officials. On Election Day the locations of many polling places were suddenly changed without notice in an effort to lose the Negroes. The whites appeared with rifles in hand and turned away prospective Negro voters. Many Negroes who sought to vote under escort of United States Marshals were shot, and the Marshals with them."

When the Congress appointed an investigative commission, evidence of intimidation and fraud on a massive scale was abundant. However, the Democrats had carried the day and the election could hardly be re-staged. They hailed the result as the return of home rule to the South and the signal for an end to occupation by Federal troops.

Not long after the bloody events of 1876 the Klan was disbanded by the Army. The revulsion of some of its own leaders sped the process. General Forrest himself resigned and urged the disbanding of the Klan. However, the local Dens in many cases simply went underground and much of the residual strength of the organization was siphoned off into such groups as "The White League," the "White Brotherhood," the "Pale Faces," the "Constitutional Union Guards," and the "Knights of the White Camelia."

With the end of wholesale violence by the Klan, anti-Negro prejudice moved over into the less bloody but possibly more pernicious realm of politics. And as public concern over the out-

rages of the nightshirt brigade subsided, bigots found other targets.

Mormons and Marriage

As if to demonstrate the indiscriminate character of religious discrimination, the next religious group to come under the guns of intolerance was the Mormons. Critics singled out the readily visible Achilles heel of the group and mounted an all-out attack on plural marriage. Surely if anything offended "against church and motherhood as practiced by God-fearing folk," this was it. The offensive had begun even before the Civil War, but with the slaves freed and the Ku Klux Klan out of sight, the attack was renewed in 1882. Congress passed the Edmunds Act, penalizing the practice of plural marriage in all territories of the United States. Anyone practicing polygamy was denied the right to vote or hold office. To admit the practice was sufficient to disqualify a Mormon from jury duty.

In 1887, the Edmunds-Tucker Act strengthened anti-polygamy laws and rescinded prior legislation encouraging immigration into Utah. The measure also rigidly prohibited voting by females.

Finally, the episode came to an end with passage in 1894 of an act enabling the people of Utah to adopt a constitution and providing religious freedom while continuing the prohibition against polygamous marriages. Obviously much of the public disquiet directed at the Mormons had not been bigoted in character, for the free practice of polygamy did seem to threaten the foundations of a monogamous society. But a disturbing proportion of the anti-Mormon zeal that mounted the attack on plural marriage was related to that intolerance of difference which in earlier years had martyred many Mormons on their hegira from western New York through the Midwest to Utah.

Now the Catholics again came under scrutiny. Several decades previously, President Pierce had named a Catholic to his cabinet, as Postmaster-General. Now, what was worse, in 1884 the Republican candidate for President, James G. Blaine, was the son of a Catholic mother. Opposition to Blaine mounted among anti-Catholics and the once-familiar anti-papist fever again began to rise slowly in the land. The haters' efforts came to nought through a curious twist. At a Blaine rally, a Presby-

terian minister from New York, the Rev. Samuel Burchard, lashed out at the Democrats, whose candidate was Grover Cleveland. The campaign already had been a spectacularly dirty one, with epithets like "liar" among the kinder comments made about both candidates.

Burchard addressed the Blaine partisans thus, nearly on the eve of Election Day: "We are Republicans, and don't propose to leave our Party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been rum, Romanism and rebellion." Catholics were outraged, anti-Catholics confused, the Democrats overjoyed at public reaction and the Blaine people thunderstruck — and defeated.

Unfortunately, the cry launched by the good pastor did not die with his candidate's hopes, but was to be raised again whenever individual Catholics would show the temerity to take the "no religious test" clause in Article VI of the Constitution at face value.

In 1887 an Iowa resident, one Henry Bowers, addressed himself to what anti-Catholics saw as a growing threat posed by continuing Catholic immigration. He formed a secret order called the American Protective Association, which was to become widely known by its initials, APA. The movement grew rapidly, fed by the expansion of Catholic parochial schools and the steady influx of Catholics, mostly Irish. By 1893, APA had members organized and militant in two dozen states across the West and Midwest.

Corrupt political machines in eastern big cities, largely populated by Irish Catholics, lent added zeal to the APA crusaders. Once more, playing on the ultimate fear of anti-papists, one of the APA spokesmen warned, "the Irish would constitute a very large part of the papal army in the United States." He went on to explain that "the political dangers of Romanism are greatly increased by the concentration of Romanists in large cities."

Catholic laymen had formed a fraternal order called the Knights of Columbus in 1882. They now sought to gear it to counter the propaganda of the APA crowd. The Knights established a Commission of Religious Prejudice to combat bigotry. They were a secret organization as was the APA but their avowed purposes were limited to charity, unity, fraternity and patriotism. But the APA succeeded in making much of the populace wonder if the Knights of Columbus were not really advance agents for the Pope's legions. At its peak the APA had some 70

weekly organs spewing forth its message of suspicion and falsehood. The anti-Catholic group did its most effective propaganda work in election campaigns by creating and distributing spurious documents purporting to be Catholic instructions undermining American authority.

One bogus document of this order is still in occasional circulation. It pretends to be a secret oath of the Knights of Columbus binding members to all manner of heinous deeds against Protestants in general and the American Republic in particular.

By 1895, the anti-Catholic organization had managed to install 20 (at least) of its most dependable members in Congress, although all were elected on regular party tickets. The body never undertook to make itself a political party. In 1896, the group began to fall apart. Normally they would have endorsed McKinley, a Republican, since the Democrats were notoriously soft on Catholics. But McKinley was known to have Catholic friends, and in the light of this damning evidence, the APA reasoned, whom could you trust?

As what we now call the Gay Nineties got under way, a bright, ambitious and flexible young Congressman from Georgia was preparing to move onto the national scene. Tom Watson was to become one of the most thoroughgoing demagogues the country had seen. Gathering his first strength with the startling early successes of the Populist movement, Watson was on the way up in the party when it was swallowed up by the Democrats in 1896.

Attaching himself to a surviving splinter, Watson strove to fan the embers of the party, but in vain. After the Spanish-American War he tried repeatedly to command serious attention as a Presidential candidate and did worse each time. Frustrated, he turned to the most arrant demagoguery. With fine impartiality he spewed venom at Negroes, Catholics and Jews.

Occasionally Watson managed to combine his targets. In a magazine he published in Atlanta, he editorialized thus: "Heavens above! Think of a Negro priest taking the vow of chastity and then being turned loose among women who have been taught that a priest cannot sin. It is a thing to make one shudder." Nothing was sacred to Watson; anything went, so long as it seemed to support his major thesis on the Catholics. As a headline on a lead editorial he once wrote summarized it: "The Roman Catholic Hierarchy: the Deadliest Menace to Our Liberties and Our Civilization."

Within the span of Watson's hate-ridden career the immigration of Jews reached a peak. In the half-century ending in 1870, some 300,000 Jews had arrived here. In the single year of 1906, 150,000 came into the United States, refugees from assorted pogroms in Poland, the Ukraine and Rumania. In the fifty years centering on 1906, two-and-one-quarter million Jews found haven here.

Tom Watson was not a man to let such a challenge pass. His specialty in the field of scurrilous anti-Semitic publication was fanciful or distorted tales of unscrupulous bankruptcies brought about by scheming Jewish merchants, or any other way to present the Jews as dealers in fraud. As World War I broke out in Europe, he was handed a plum in his own bailiwick, Atlanta. In 1915, Leo Frank, a Jewish resident of that city, was tried on a charge of raping and murdering a 14-year-old girl. Although the bulk of the evidence did not actually point to him, he was convicted and sentenced to death. Throughout the country important people and groups protested this miscarriage of justice. Goaded by this national protest and angered by a gubernatorial commutation of his death sentence to a prison term, a bigoted mob snatched Frank from prison and lynched him.

Watson capitalized on the sensational nature of the case, and on the fact that Frank was a Jew, to build circulation for his hate sheet and influence for himself. He not only justified the lynching in his paper, but in the process he revived an ancient canard about Jewish ritual murder.

Watson ran for the United States Senate in 1920 and won in spite of opposition by most of the responsible press. He died in 1922.

"Racial Nationalism"

Since the time of the Spanish-American War, a philosophy of "racial nationalism" had been developing in the United States. Proponents of this notion found assorted "scientific" proof that, after all, men were not necessarily born equal. The first and most obvious target for this attention was the Negro. The difference between a Negro and a caucasian was readily discernible and could be made to support the pre-Nazi theory of racial superiority.

Next in line were the Chinese. Since the time of President Hayes, agitation for a change in immigration policy, especially

concerning the Chinese, had been substantial. Ironically, another immigrant, an Irishman named Dennis Kearney, had fanned public opinion in California to such a frenzy during the Hayes administration that resultant political pressure forced the exclusion of the Chinese, on the ground that they were undermining American labor.

Congress tried repeatedly to toughen anti-Chinese measures by imposing a literacy test as one of the conditions of immigration. The bill was vetoed by three Presidents, Cleveland, Taft and Wilson. Finally, the measure was enacted over Wilson's veto.

One of the handy features of the racial nationalism hypothesis was that almost anyone could play, and anyone could be the target, so long as there existed a visible if superficial difference between the hater and the hated. As the United States approached its entry in the war to make the world safe for democracy, the theory was used to demonstrate the inferiority of Italians, Slavs, Jews and other minorities. Proud Americans, the idea went, surely did not want to adulterate their Anglo-Saxon blood with the lesser vital fluid of such groups.

This attention to Anglo-Saxon heritage, incidentally, was another relic of Know-Nothingism. The phrase had come into the language under those malevolent auspices. Unfortunately, it is still with us.

The other significant development on the eve of the first World War — from the standpoint of prejudice and politics — was the revival of the Ku Klux Klan idea, based on a wider range of hate. The 19th century Klan was not reborn. But in Atlanta, in 1915, one Joseph Simmons incorporated an organization under the name of "Ku Klux Klan, Inc."

A major catalyst in the re-emergence of the haters had been the fulminations of Tom Watson. But what really set them to crawling out of the woodwork was a publication of somewhat more specific aims than those conceived by the Georgia demagogue. Ironically, this publication was titled, "The Menace." Established in 1911 at Aurora, Missouri, the sheet operated on this platform: "The Catholic Political Machine in its intrigues and its interference with established American institutions, is the deadliest enemy to our civilization and liberties."

Most Americans had found a deadlier enemy. The United States declared war on Germany on April 6, 1917.

IV

WORLD WAR I TO THE RISE OF HITLER

The World War effectively halted immigration to the United States, and never was it resumed on a pre-war scale. In 1924 the gates were closed sufficiently as to almost insure that it never would be.

Americans came out of the war to end war disillusioned and prone to cynicism. They were fed up with Europe, with Europe's troubles and Europe's masses of hopeful emigrants to the New World. The time was ripe for isolationism. It perfectly fit the mood of the post-war era. The spurious doctrine of Anglo-Saxon superiority had found fairly wide acceptance. Labor feared the effects of cheap immigrant competition for jobs. Many Americans feared that "certain nationalities" were less law-abiding than they. Many others feared foreign ideologies, and already, while the Bolsheviks were only beginning to consolidate the gains of their successful revolution, prophetic fears of Communist subversion had arisen. All these worries, some valid, many just plain neurotic, blended into a national attitude which felt that somehow too many foreigners would undermine our social unity. Immigration as it had existed was finished.

For the bigot, here was an opportunity to stop worrying about the foreigners that kept flooding in, and to concentrate on the ones that were already here.

And the easiest target at this moment in the history of hate was the Jew.

It was not difficult for European ideas about Jews to wing their way across the ocean. Bigotry here has always borne some relation to what was going on in Europe, except for the indigenous problem of freed slaves. Anti-Semitism had long been a tool of the Russian Czars. Anti-Semitism was not new in Germany or in France, as witness the Dreyfus case. So the Jews again came under attack.

In 1920, industrialist Henry Ford began a series of attacks

on Jews in his weekly newspaper, the Dearborn Independent. In addition to the relatively small circulation of the newspaper, his views were republished in book form and widely circulated in the United States and throughout the world.

Ford propagated notions like the "Jewish trade monopoly" theme and suggested that the Rothschilds and the Guggenheims dominated international capitalism. He accused Jews of an assortment of underhanded and shady deals, and attributed communist designs to such distinguished Jews as Bernard Baruch and Aaron Sapiro. In 1927 Sapiro sued Ford for $1,000,000. By June of that year, the industrialist began to recant, and eventually retracted all his defamatory stories.

Unfortunately, however, the damage here at home had already been done. The denial rarely catches up with the charge. Worse, the material was reprinted and used in Germany to foment hatred of the Jews in the Hitler era.

But a subtle, very slow, and ultimately hopeful metamorphosis seemed to be taking place in the psychology of American prejudice. Possibly the reaction had set in as early as the time of the mad excesses of the Know-Nothings. Perhaps Tom Watson's pre-war spurt of venom started it. Nevertheless, socially conscious churchmen were diligently and effectively fighting social injustice. Many a parishioner smugly accepted a stereotype of himself as a good, gracious, wise and generous Christian, far above the level of the rabble-rouser. America was fat and victorious, and perhaps there was a feeling that being tolerant toward minorities was a gesture that looked good and cost nothing. But whatever the causes, the fact was that it was gradually becoming unfashionable to give public expression to bigotry.

Let it be promptly said that the trend has not reached its apex. However, it was underway.

Among the groups not yet touched by this benign influence was the resurging Ku Klux Klan, which had begun to rear its sheeted head in 1915.

Here was a rich source of antagonism to Catholics, Jews, Negroes and the foreign-born. Shortly after the war the Klan became involved in a campaign of terror in the familiar manner of the original post-Civil War Klan. Congress investigated the Klan revival in 1921 and found it not only to be an organization of terrorists but also a thriving business on a disconcertingly

large scale. Estimates of total Klan revenues in 1921 ran as high as $8 million. Promoting its cause — and in the opinion of many observers, promoting the personal income of its leaders — were two publications. One, the *Herald*, pictured the Klan as an organization of rare patriotism, dedicated to the principles of the founders of the republic (white supremacy). The other, the semi-official *Searchlight*, maintained a stream of racial and religious hatred.

Unfortunately, the Congressional hearings had an effect which was perhaps greater than the two publications in stimulating Klan growth. Klansmen with stern faces testified to their zeal for the nation, and investigators cited impressive membership and financial figures. By 1922, the Klan's leader, Joseph Simmons, of Atlanta, estimated 3,500 Americans were joining his organization every day, bringing his revenues to $45,000 a day and total membership to 1,200,000. Members were to be found in every state, Alaska and the Panama Canal Zone. The Klan's list of targets was broad enough to appeal across so wide a geographic range. Here was something for everybody to hate.

By 1925, the Klan claimed 5 million members. Most of them were in the South. But even in the South, the Klan was getting into trouble. In 1922, the governor of Louisiana sought Federal support to put an end to Klan rule in his state. The governor of Georgia attributed 135 lynchings in a two-year period to the Klan.

In an embarrassing episode in Pennsylvania, the Klan took legal action against five of its members who allegedly had collected $15 million in the state and had neglected to account for it properly. The organization sought damages of $100,000. The five pleaded financial irresponsibility, a defense not without a certain ring of truth. The accused quintet counter-charged that the Klan had inspired or conducted riots, floggings, kidnappings and murders in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania — testimony the Klan did not refute.

Foes of the Klan formed a National Vigilance Association to oppose them. The Vigilance group sought legislation in the states and in Washington proscribing mob violence, outlawing the wearing of masks and hoods, and forcing publication of the membership rolls of secret organizations.

The states began to take action, among them New York, Iowa, Minnesota, and Michigan.

Although the Klan professed to be a Christian organization, it still kept up a steady stream of anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish and anti-Negro depredations. But, "not only did minority groups feel the sting of its displeasure," says historian Robert Moats Miller, "but union organizers, birth control advocates, internationalists, village reprobates, and 'fallen' women as well. As these good, substantial, bed-sheeted citizens rode off in their model T's or on their plow horses to do their nightly, patriotic Christian business," he continues, "one wonders if the more thoughtful members did not quiet their consciences with the words from the old hymn, 'God moves in a mysterious way.' "

Scholars agree, says Dr. Miller, that the movement "worked hand-in-glove with the more fundamentalist denominations, that it received the open or tacit support of countless clergymen, and that many of its officers were Protestant preachers." However, Protestant voices were raised against the Klan, and some stern and potent ones among them. The undenominational and highly influential *Christian Century* said in one of a great many hostile editorials, "if it succeeds, Christianity fails, no matter what other gains may be thought won." Said the editors of *Christian World:* a "religious revival under the auspices of the Klan reminds one of the 'Christian' mob in Russia or Poland or Rumania howling for blood in the Jewish quarter, for the glory of the good Lord Christ."

Many ministers denounced the Klan from the pulpit, rebuked hooded men who entered their churches, spurned the proffered envelopes of contributions. Perhaps the ultimate in this category is another episode cited by Miller. Southern Methodist Bishop W. F. McMurray, confronting one of his ministers who had boosted the Klan, punched him in the mouth.

The influence of the Klan during its heyday in the mid-twenties must occasion disturbed concern to this day. In Oregon, the movement secured passage of a school law (later declared unconstitutional) requiring *all* children to attend the public schools. It elected governors and congressmen, fought liberal education in such ways as promoting legislation outlawing the teaching of evolution, stimulated passage of restrictive legislation in a number of states. The Klan opposed a plank denouncing it in the Democratic convention of 1924, and succeeded in its opposition to the extent that the less specific of two versions proffered was adopted. It fought the efforts of Al Smith to win the 1924

nomination and certainly was partly responsible for turning him back at that time. In the 1928 campaign, which will be treated at greater length later, the Klan circulated volumes of the "Knights of Columbus oath" which had repeatedly been proven a malicious fraud. The Knights of Columbus took criminal action against circulators of this false document on that occasion, and won many convictions.

The group's 1925 peak of five million members was not maintained, and it dwindled to some 30,000 five years later.

The 1928 Campaign

As the Klan was fading away another Catholic-hater picked up its smoky torch. U. S. Senator Thomas Heflin of Alabama made a three-hour Senate speech denouncing the Catholic church and the Knights of Columbus. This was the first of a series. Copies, printed at government expense, were distributed widely through the mails. Later it was charged that Heflin had been amply remunerated by the Klan for his services.

Alfred E. Smith's campaign for the Presidency of the United States has been debated by politicians, political scientists, churchmen and sociologists until the subject has very nearly been exhausted. Nothing can hide the fact that the crudest form of anti-Catholic bigotry played a major part in the campaign against the popular New York governor. But it is impossible to assess accurately the influence of this scurrility in his defeat.

Smith was a New Yorker, with an East Side New York accent; he was the son of an immigrant, he was in favor of Demon Rum, he was a product of the political machine of Tammany Hall. All of these were cardinal sins in much of the United States. He also was a devout Roman Catholic, and as the history of American anti-Catholicism amply reveals, that, too, was a cardinal sin to many. The fact that he was a Democrat probably should not be underestimated. There is little evidence to support the notion that 1928 would have been a Democratic year except for Smith's candidacy.

In a number of documented cases, Protestant ministers denounced him from the pulpit. This was true particularly in the South. But recent political research into election records has revealed that some southern communities which were normally solidly Democratic, but where the influence of the Protestant

clergy is also acknowledged to be profound, went along with their Democratic tradition and voted for Smith despite the urgings of their preachers to the contrary.

Nothing that can be discovered about why *else* Smith lost can atone for the shocking bigotry that was raised against him, however. Cartoons in the newspapers, speeches, leaflets ranged from wild fabrications to clever distortions. Whispers, letter-writing campaigns, sly references to "ring-kissing" and many other subtle and direct means were used to link Smith to the Roman Catholic Church in areas where they could only be presumed to rally prejudice.

One of the devices used against Smith was the old and fraudulent document that pretended to be the secret oath of the Knights of Columbus. In 1912, this bogus oath had been circulated against a Catholic candidate for Congress and, as a result of investigation by the House Elections Committee, it had been exposed in the Congress as a vicious fraud. The text of the so-called oath was published in the Congressional Record. Thus, innocently, a heritage was left for latter-day bigots. Anti-Catholics opposing Smith in 1928 reproduced the oath and circulated it widely, claiming its appearance in the Congressional Record as proof of its validity, never, of course, mentioning the fact that the "oath" was cited in the Record as a damnable hoax. To this day, bigots occasionally resurrect the "K.C. oath" and circulate it among Catholic-haters whose credulity exceeds their intellect.

However, perhaps some good did come out of the 1928 campaign. For one thing, its base character stimulated existing agencies for intergroup harmony to explore and develop new educational programs, and led to the establishment of others to fight the intergroup hatreds and suspicions that made possible the wretchedness of 1928. Perhaps it should be added that leading figures within all responsible religious groups cooperate in such efforts without blurring valid distinctions of faith or practice.

The other benefit — less visible and less certain — that accrued to the Smith vilification may be that public revulsion at the spectacle of such rank unfairness renders a repetition less likely. We shall see.

V

THE RISE OF HITLER TO THE PRESENT

After 1930 the pattern of native anti-Semitism in the United States changed palpably. Much less frequently did one see the crude diatribe characteristic of the *Dearborn Independent,* or hear Klansmen ranting against the Jews. A more subtle and less inflammatory breed of prejudice emerged, manifesting itself in housing and employment. No written or spoken policy stipulated that no Jews be hired, but by curious coincidence in many firms no Jews were hired. In real estate and "desirable" rental housing, Jews were sometimes proscribed by legally drawn restrictive covenants, perhaps more often by "gentlemen's agreements."

Anti-Semitism in the United States had lost its strident character. Had lost it, that is, until the home-grown variety of prejudice gave way to a more potent imported brand, brewed and bottled in Germany.

Once again it was about to be proven that the practice of prejudice in the New World nearly always relates to the Old. In the Hitler era, incidentally, this relationship worked both ways. Henry Ford's contribution to the literature of hate, although by now repudiated by the old gentleman himself, was played back by no less distinguished a Jew-hater than Hitler himself, who caused translations of the early Ford screeds to be circulated widely in the Fatherland. And on Ford's 75th birthday, the Fuehrer presented the manufacturer with a medal. He accepted it, to the sorrow of most of his countrymen.

After Hitler came to power in 1933, the United States denounced his action toward the Jews with conviction and increasing fervor. The Nazi leader retaliated by unleashing a massive anti-Semitic campaign in the United States. Organizations of German-Americans, German war veterans, Americans of German descent, all were organized. When the German-American Bund was established in New York in 1933, all the other Nazi-minded groups were related to it as closely as possible. The Bund

reached its greatest strength in 1936, but in 1938 it mustered enough support to pour 19,000 adherents into Madison Square Garden for a mass meeting.

The Bund was quick to enlist the cooperation of home-grown hate peddlers like the "Christian Front," the "Christian Mobilizers," the "Silver Shirts," the "Social Justice Society," the "Industrial Defense Associates," and the "Knights of the White Camelia." For the White Supremacy crowd, *nordic* supremacy was an easy step. To the anti-papists, Hitler was a colleague. And among anti-Semites, here was the acknowledged leader.

The developing war brought the Bund to a stop. Its end was somewhat speeded when its leader, Fritz Kuhn, was jailed for stealing funds from his own beloved hate group. However, the end of the Bund in America did not put a stop to the mischief it had sown.

The native supporters of the Bund continued their Nazi-style propaganda on their own until, in 1942, the Silver Shirt chieftain William Dudley Pelley, the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling and 25 others were indicted by the United States Government for allegedly conspiring to undermine the morale of the armed forces. The long-drawn-out sedition trial actually got under way two years later but came to an inconclusive end when the presiding judge died. The war had ended and the case was never reopened.

Anti-Semites who did not tinge their hate-sheets with pro-Nazi *political* overtones escaped prosecution but were able to make little headway during the war years. Times of major national crisis have granted little advantage to bigots, for the bulk of the populace at such times is too busy for the distractions offered by the hate-mongers. This does not hold true, however, for the really dedicated bigots themselves, nor does it for individuals so frustrated by uncontrollable circumstances that they simply must find a scapegoat. An illustration is the Presidential campaign of 1940.

Wendell Willkie had a German name and a German ancestral background. Political enemies implied in scurrilous literature that he was pro-Nazi. It was already becoming smart in some circles to suggest that Roosevelt's real name was Rosenfeld, and that the President was Jewish. These tactics marred an election in which national unity was truly of utmost importance. All in all, the 1940 campaign was quite a dirty one on both sides. The political

scientist, Hugh Bone, compiled a long pamphlet consisting almost entirely of reproductions and quotations from smear literature in that Presidential election. Its title, aptly, was "Smear Politics."

Willkie, incidentally, was proferred the endorsement of Father Coughlin, a notorious anti-Semite. Scorchingly rejecting such support, Willkie angrily concluded, "I have no place in my philosophy for such beliefs . . . I don't have to be President of the United States, but I do have to make my beliefs clear, that is, in order to live with myself. I am not interested in being President of the United States to compromise with my fundamental beliefs."

Guilt by Association

Roosevelt-haters in the 1944 campaign seized on a phrase attributed to the President during the Democratic Convention: "Clear it with Sidney." "Sidney" was Sidney Hillman, a prominent Jewish labor leader. Much was made of the comment, and heavy-handed innuendoes circulated throughout the campaign. Some Republican Congressmen circulated literature (under their franks) which said: "Browder, Hillman and the Communists will vote. Will you?" This tactic of guilt by association of names was relatively new at the time, but much more was to be seen of it before long. Foes of the Democratic President also stressed Hillman's rabbinic education, another technique which would be seen again.

In 1948 Harry Truman was the target of Southerners within his Democratic Party because of his unflagging stand favoring civil rights for Negroes. The Southerners "seceded" from the party in 1948, running Strom Thurmond on a States Rights ticket. Curiously, left-wing members also split away in the same year, draining more support from what normally would have been the Democratic column. Surprisingly, with more than two million votes drained off by the two splinter groups, Truman managed to beat Dewey, the Republican nominee, by nearly two million votes.

Not long after Truman's surprise victory in 1948, a new American demagogue took a position on the world stage. The late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, had had an undistinguished career, actually being voted worst senator in a poll of capital correspondents. Two years before the expiration of his first term he stumbled on an issue that was to make his

name an international by-word, and a term of opprobrium — depending on where you sat.

McCarthy developed a technique of making general accusations about Communist infiltration in government in public meettings, and then making specific charges, with names and dates which he never actually proved, on the floor of the Senate, where he was immune from prosecution for libel. McCarthyism itself is not of direct concern to this examination of racial and religious prejudice in politics, but one of its side effects is. McCarthy was a Catholic, and to a number of his co-religionists the fact of his Catholicism seemed to lend support to his undocumented charges. Conversely, and equally disturbingly, he had the effect of stimulating anti-Catholic bias in non-Catholics who thought he was an opportunist and a liar. The effects of the McCarthy era have not yet worn off completely.

Anti-Semitism enjoyed a resurgence in the post-war years, due in good measure, to the efforts of native Jew-haters. William Dudley Pelley was back at the old stand, Silver Shirt and all, and so were the tireless and ubiquitous Gerald Winrod, Gerald L. K. Smith, Conde McGinley and Joseph P. Kamp. The participation in politics of such pamphleteers and rabble-rousers has been spotty and usually limited to the extent of their own followers. But on occasion, one or another of them has managed to inject himself into a political campaign on a wide scale. Thus, in 1952, Kamp depicted General Eisenhower as a tool of Jewish bankers and won for himself denunciation from every side but the lunatic fringe on the far right.

Gerald L. K. Smith, like his comrades-in-hate constantly trying to get into the act, often endorses candidates he particularly admires. During the 1956 Republican convention, for example, Smith mounted a staircase in a San Francisco hotel lobby filled with newsmen and endorsed Vice-President Nixon. It took about 20 minutes for word of this development to work its way across town to the Convention, where Nixon contemptuously rejected the bigot's support.

At the close of the 1940's, deep and genuine public concern over Communist infiltration of the Government was whipped into an angry climate of suspicion by McCarthyites and, to a lesser extent, by the professional bigots. As a result, the election campaigns of 1950, 1952 and 1954 were among the dirtiest in recent memory. Character assassination was widespread, as were

guilt by association, innuendo and implication, and sly suggestions that this or that senator or congressman was really a foreign agent. These excesses led to one encouraging development.

A group of citizens who were sickened by such tactics, and by the appeals to religious and racial bigotry which so often accompanied them, determined to do something about it.

In 1950, a Senate elections subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator Guy Gillette of Iowa studied charges of foul play in several campaigns. The Subcommittee report on one of these cases (involving a notorious composite photograph depicting Communist leader Earl Browder in seemingly intimate discourse with conservative Democratic Senator Millard Tydings) made a recommendation which amplified an idea advanced to the subcommittee by a Senate colleague, William Benton of Connecticut. The recommendation: a committee of eminent members of both parties could do more to create a moral climate in which unfair campaign practices would be unacceptable to the voters than could legislation.

Fair Campaign Practices Committee

The action taken by the citizens who were concerned over dirty campaigning in 1954 was to implement the proposals of Senators Gillette and Benton. They established the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, a national, non-partisan and non-profit educational organization. The Committee adopted a model Code of Fair Campaign Practices which was also proposed by the Gillette subcommittee. The practice of the Committee is to call on all major candidates to pledge publicly that they will uphold this Code of Fair Campaign Practices as they seek election. Response to this challenge has increased steadily, and in 1958 the Code was a factor in more than 85 per cent of all Congressional and gubernatorial campaigns.

The efforts made by the Committee did not start early enough to have much effect on the 1954 campaign, but in 1956, between the fact of code-signing by candidates, and the widespread attention received in the press, impartial observers believe it helped to make the 1956 campaign substantially cleaner than its predecessor.

A year later the Fair Campaign Practices Committee undertook the first of a biennial series of state-by-state studies on

the actual use of unfair campaigning. The second Smear Study, on the 1958 campaign, revealed a decrease of anti-Semitism and less anti-Negro material but showed a sharp and disquieting increase in anti-Catholicism in the election.

In California, for example, a special initiative proposition was on the ballot which would have made California the only state in the Union to tax private and parochial schools. The measure engendered the worst kind of anti-Catholic propaganda, including one item which pointed out that "many Mafia gangsters (*Ed:* it then detailed a list of criminal activities participated in by those people) are Catholics, and some presumably Catholic educated." Therefore, in the peculiar logic of bigotry, tax the Catholic schools (which made up 65 per cent of all those covered by the proposition). Incidentally, the proposition was defeated.

There were other examples of vicious anti-Catholicism directed at candidates for governor and for Congress. In the main these efforts backfired, which, in part at least, is a tribute to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, for the group aims at informing voters of smear techniques in order that they may be better able to identify them when they occur in actual campaign situations.

Politics Today . . . and Jews

One example of an appeal to anti-Semitism that did not quite qualify as direct anti-Semitism, also took place in California. Totton J. Anderson, professor of political science at the University of Southern California, describes the episode in the *Western Political Quarterly*.

An incumbent Congressman prepared a pamphlet that purported to contrast the public records of [the two candidates] by presenting the incumbent as a native-born Gentile and his opponent as a foreign-born Jew. Under the various categories listed in parallel columns, [the challenger's] former occupation was given as Rabbi; his birthplace, Berlin; his educational background, the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, Germany . . . His organizational affiliation, Amercans for Democratic Action (characterized as a left-wing faction with a program of 'laundered Communism'), was placed opposite [the incumbent's] American Legion affiliation. 'Who's Who in America' was cited as the source of [the incumbent's] record and 'Who's Who in World Jewry' for [the challenger's] background."

There was an immediate outcry against the leaflet, and the congressman withdrew it from circulation at once, so that half of the 100,000 print order was never distributed.

More recently, in a New York City primary contest, a rare and ironic twist on the Jewishness of a politician became an "issue." An incumbent Congressman and his primary rival both were Jews. The challenger's father had been born in an Arab country and his mother in Russia (both were Jews). He complained bitterly that the incumbent campaigned throughout the heavily Jewish district implying that his rival was an Arab, and therefore not to be trusted by Jews. For once, a candidate complained because his opponent said he was *not* Jewish.

The truly rabid and vicious anti-Semitic material that occasionally appears in election campaigns virtually never comes from any political figure with some pretense to responsibility. Bigots and haters almost always are found at the core of truly vicious anti-Semitic campaign drives. Accusations of anti-Semitism are sometimes a different matter. In the closing days of the 1960 Presidential campaign, voters in cities with substantial Jewish populations were all but snowed under with tracts sponsored by various political hangers-on. Kennedy, Nixon, Johnson, Lodge were "anti-Semites" for various reasons, ranging from exposure to Arabs at the U.N. to exposure to a "bigoted" father in childhood. The balance in this case was rare, and its effect virtually cancelled out.

. . . and Catholics

In 1960, the number one target of prejudice in the political arena clearly became the Roman Catholics. In 1928, Al Smith, and conceivably Senator Tom Walsh, were plausible as Presidential candidates. But by 1960 a literal handful of candidates could be conceived of as logical Presidential material. Discussion of the possibility preoccupied millions of Americans from 1959 or before.

Bigotry appeared early in the Presidential year. Long-established publishers of anti-Catholic screeds suddenly found their smudged tracts reaching circulations of millions, instead of merely thousands of frightened anti-Papists. Thoughtful Protestant clergymen agonized in the pulpit, in letters-to-the-editor columns, and in neighborhood conversations over whether a Roman Catholic in the White House could survive the presumed conflict between his vows as a Catholic and as an American President.

17

The Fair Campaign Practices Committee convened a panel of distinguished lay and clerical theological and social thinkers, including Protestants, Catholics and Jews, to confront the question. A set of recommendations emerged from the two-day discussion, urging Americans to judge a candidate by his qualifications and his positions relevant to the office. "A candidate's religion is relevant to a voter's decision," the Committee declared, "but only so far as it bears on such relevant political issues."

The recommendations emphasized that "Stirring up, fostering, or tolerating religious animosity" was an unfair campaign practice.

Nonetheless, when Kennedy was nominated, the onslaught began. Predictably from the "bible belts," unforeseen (and in much greater volume) from more "temperate" areas, there appeared hundreds and hundreds of tracts, screeds, mimeographed sheets and lavishly printed four-color booklets, all wondering, doubting, accusing, about Catholic loyalties to the Vatican and whether they would precede loyalty to the United States.

Vastly more of this out-pouring was moderate, responsible and non-inflamatory than was the case in 1928. But an appalling number of tracts, sermons and statements fed the flames of bigotry.

When the votes were counted, of course, Americans had laid — for a combination of theological and non-theological reasons — the ancient ghost of the scandalous "law" that a Catholic could never be President.*

The brief Kennedy administration put to rest the fears of most of the thoughtful opponents of a Catholic in the White House. Even POAU** editorialized favorably in 1961 on Kennedy's evident determination to keep church and state separate.

---

* One cannot leave this subject without praising Republican candidate Nixon's conduct on the issue. Repeatedly he refused to comment on loaded questions put to him by reporters, observing only that "religion is not an issue between Mr. Kennedy and me."

** Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, which in 1960 gave nationwide circulation to a tract by its associate director, C. Stanley Lowell, highlighting the "Protestant" apprehension: "It is an immature concept of public function which Protestants fear in a Catholic President. They fear, too, a daily circus of priests and nuns parading in full regalia in and out of the White House to the accompaniment of endless photos on the front pages, the back pages, and the middle pages." (*Protestants, Catholics and Politics*, POAU, Washington, 1960.) Even in death the assassinated President, and the funeral arrangements made by his Catholic widow, quietly, and with an impeccable "concept of public function," helped still the fears of the bigoted and the perplexed, alike.

Had President Kennedy lived, it is certain that a re-election campaign would not have seen the fantastic volume of anti-Catholic campaign materials to which voters were subjected in 1960. The bigots would have been reduced, largely, to talking to themselves — happily, their normal stance — and their impact on the whole electorate would have been minimal.

A few would have mouthed the line that was being heard at the time of his assassination: that any Catholic could be expected to "lean over backward" in his first term, and then, safely re-elected, pull out all the stops — Jesuits to judgeships and the whole paranoid picture.

. . . and Negroes

So far, as the old South has continued its fight against desegregation, anti-Negro material in election campaigns has been rare. There are exceptions. An obvious one is the election of school boards and other local offices. In border states, scurrilous anti-Negro material often appears during state and Congressional elections, mostly on behalf of third-party segregationist groups who lump Democrats and Republicans together as "race mongrelizers." (The die-hard segregationist clings to the line that the inevitable end, and the real aim, of desegregation is intermarriage and the destruction of our society.)

Within the Old South, race occasionally arises as an indirect issue in primaries. It is a simple fact of political life in the South that softness toward the very idea of integration means — almost inevitably — political suicide. And so occasionally a primary candidate will be the victim of guilt by association: it may be charged that he is friendly with, or has run on a slate with, a known advocate of desegregation. Changes in the segregated South already have occurred faster than many southern observers believed possible. Ironically, the very speed of these changes can only speed the appearance of vicious anti-Negro campaign material in the region, for they mean that the Negro voter will be a real factor in Southern elections for the first time since Reconstruction days.

Northern states, meanwhile, will continue to see race-baiting as an everyday political phenomenon. Particularly in municipal elections, wherever urban renewal has become essential to cure the paralysis of slums, the issue of races is exploited regularly.

Perhaps the most common tactic is the whispering campaign.

Where there is a Negro candidate for city council or some such office, he is the obvious target. The story circulates — as it has done repeatedly in Cincinnati, for one example — that the Negro candidate is buying up houses (sometimes through a "front," sometimes directly) in the white neighborhoods, for resale to Negroes. Sometimes the story is circulated that the target-candidate has pledged to Negro friends that he will "put a Negro family in every block in Cincinnati" (or you name the city). When this task is pursued in any printed form, greater caution is indicated, as in the case of a mimeographed letter circulated in a recent Philadelphia city election which warned that residents of "certain districts" were to be moved into every good neighborhood of the city.

In the three and one-third centuries since 1628, Americans have learned much about tolerance. Few Americans are comfortable at the prospect of voting *for* a Catholic, or a Jew, or a Negro, *because* he is a Catholic or Jew or Negro. Few Americans can afford to be comfortable at this late date in history at the prospect of voting *against* a member of any minority *because* he is a minority-group member and *in spite* of his being the best man.

We live in a pluralistic society where hard-won religious and ethnic tolerance is, at least verbally, supported everywhere, and is supported practically in most places. Yet the gap between verbal and practical support, narrowing though it is, still demonstrates that prejudice and politics are not easy to separate.

And this fact confronts us with a challenge to action. What can a citizen — presuming he is one of good will — do to bring practice into line with profession?

Lessons for Americans

For one thing, the citizen can learn valuable lessons from the past we have reviewed here. He can learn not to fall for vicious and spurious notions that people of one race or faith are therefore inferior to those of another. He can learn to suspect stories or rumors or implications that are too pat, or unauthenticated, or just plain inflammatory.

The citizen can pay more attention to politics, to learn more about how this nation and the states and counties and communities that comprise it are governed. He can involve himself in the actual governing of political parties and clubs, by occasionally watching legislative bodies in actual operation.

He can learn that the stereotype of the politician is no more valid than the stereotype of the Negro or Jew or Catholic. He can come to know politicians for what they are: citizens sufficiently interested in politics and government to involve themselves in it, and on the average no better and no worse than their neighbors and constituents.

The citizen can learn that the "average voter" can, in fact, exert absolute control over politics in his community, and over the use of prejudice in politics.

For prejudice and politics have one thing in common: each can work only so far as people are willing to accept it. Prejudice operates where people are willing to let it hold sway over their minds and beliefs and actions. Politics can operate only so far as people accept it as *the means* by which governments are constituted and conducted. The citizen who calls politics beneath his consideration is depriving himself of his only opportunity to share in governing himself and his neighbors.

In the final analysis, the voter who is fooled and the citizen who is misgoverned have only themselves to blame for their plight. And the realization of that fact is our brightest hope for the future of the United States of America.

51

APPENDIX A

THE ELEMENTS OF SMEAR

From "Fair Play in Politics," a pamphlet for schools and discussion groups, by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc.

Campaigning by smear and slander, by distortion and innuendo, by appeals to race or religious prejudice really are attempts to cheat the voter of his right to make an honest choice. Unfortunately, it is rarely easy to determine what is true and what false in a campaign. If you credit a liar with even a little intelligence and ingenuity, his lie will be hard to detect. Blatant, self-evident slander is rare these days. Dirty campaign tactics nearly always seek to wear a respectable face.

"HOT" NEED NOT MEAN "DIRTY"

To have clean election campaigns it is not necessary to "take the steam out of American politics." Vigorous campaigns, colorful, hard-fought and even bitter campaigns need not be dirty campaigns. There is ample room between the positions of the Republican and Democratic parties, and between the beliefs and policies of opposing candidates, for genuine and heated argument. Out of such argument — provided the listeners are "critical listeners who ask for evidence" — grows public understanding of the stands of rival office-seekers — a sound basis for decision at the polls.

This appendix deals with *the distinction between what is fair and what is unfair* in a political campaign, and with *how to recognize what is unfair*. In our country today some tactics are universally regarded as unfair. Others may be counted fair by one person in one situation, and quite unfair by another man in another situation. Every citizen needs to be able to judge each case by itself, both in terms of the existing general standard (the Code of Fair Campaign Practices), and on the basis of his own convictions and experience.

WHAT IS A SMEAR?

In discussions of fair and unfair campaign practices, "smear" has come to be a sort of short-hand term covering a wide range of unfair practices. Literally, a smear is a blot or stain on one's reputation, or an effort to sully or besmirch a reputation.

A political candidate can be smeared in a variety of ways. He

may be vilified, that is, he may be called names in a particularly offensive manner. Name-calling is an ancient propaganda device.

He may be the target of whispers that he is immoral or dishonest or disloyal — and the whispers never refer to any genuine evidence or identify their real source.

He may be the victim of outright lies, which are called slander if spoken and libel if published. Laws governing libel and slander are not often enforced when political campaigns are involved, and even when a candidate goes to court, litigation takes time and money and rarely results in more than a token victory — and that long after Election Day.

Any real or imagined indiscretions or past sins in the life of a candidate's family may be exposed to suggest that the candidate himself is suspect.

Some campaigners have made the point that a candidate need not be *proved* guilty of anything, that simply creating suspicion about him is sufficient to generate votes against him.

A candidate's voting record or past statements may be taken out of context and can present a totally false picture of his position. Another similar device is to alter a photograph, either deleting part of it or inserting part of another photograph to change the apparent circumstances.

RACE AND RELIGION

Appeals to racial or religious prejudice can be raised against a candidate or a member of his family. In spite of the fact that the Constitution provides that religion may not be a test for any public office, the use of such prejudice is something like a lawyer's statement in court which the judge orders stricken from the record. It may not be in the record, but the members of the jury have heard it and it will be difficult to erase from their minds.

Investigation through the Smear Studies has shown that most unfair campaigning falls into recognizable categories. There are several kinds of smear that occur most frequently. There are standard and recognizable techniques for spreading unfair charges. And smears may also be broken down into categories by the medium through which they are circulated. Some of the techniques and some of the media are never used in responsible campaigning, and so their very use is like a red flag to the citizen who does not want to be fooled.

For example, any literature that does not name its author and tell you where it was published is automatically suspect: it says to you, in effect, "the author of this material is ashamed (or afraid) to put his name to it."

Rumor campaigns are almost always *spread* (as distinct from *originated*) largely by innocent people who believe what they are repeating. They simply don't take the trouble to check on the source

("... my brother heard it from a clerk in the supermarket who got it from her sister-in-law who heard it...").

Timing is another important factor in gauging the reliability of startling reports about a candidate. Some countries and some states have laws prohibiting the publication of new charges after a certain date. Usually, though not always, a responsible and documentable charge will be brought out before the last minute. Perfect timing for a damaging lie is when it is too late for its victim to respond — for instance, election eve.

The smears in widest use today fall into one of these subject-groups:

1. False charges of links with some sort of criminal or "sinister" element.
2. False charges of "softness on Communism" or shallow patriotism.
3. False charges that a candidate is a "radical rightist."
4. Distortion of a candidate's record or true position on an issue.
5. Appeals to prejudice based on religion or race.
6. False reports to a candidate's death or illness.

The specific techniques in widest use include these:

1. Guilt by association (or kinship).
2. Innuendo.
3. Half-truths.
4. Outright lies.
5. Rumor campaigns.
6. Endorsement (or condemnation) by fake organizations.
7. Resurrection of long-disproved charges.

And the media through which these techniques are applied include:

1. Special campaign literature (often anonymous).
2. Newspaper advertisements or radio and television spot announcements.
3. News releases and speeches.
4. Word of mouth (person-to-person or by telephone).

APPENDIX B

The following Code is distributed by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. The practice of the Committee is to call on all major candidates to pledge publicly that they will uphold this Code of Fair Campaign Practices as they seek election.

Code of Fair Campaign Practices

There are basic principles of decency, honesty and fair play which every candidate for public office in the United States has a moral obligation to observe and uphold, in order that, after vigorously contested but fairly conducted campaigns, our citizens may exercise their constitutional right to a free and untrammeled choice and the will of the people may be fully and clearly expressed on the issues before the country.

THEREFORE:

I SHALL CONDUCT my campaign in the best American tradition, discussing the issues as I see them, presenting my record and policies with sincerity and frankness, and criticizing without fear or favor the record and policies of my opponent and his party which merit such criticism.

I SHALL DEFEND AND UPHOLD the right of every qualified American voter to full and equal participation in the electoral process.

I SHALL CONDEMN the use of personal vilification, character defamation, whispering campaigns, libel, slander, or scurrilous attacks on any candidate or his personal or family life.

I SHALL CONDEMN the use of campaign material of any sort which misrepresents, distorts, or otherwise falsifies the facts regarding any candidate, as well as the use of malicious or unfounded accusations against any candidate which aim at creating or exploiting doubts, without justification, as to his loyalty and patriotism.

I SHALL CONDEMN any appeal to prejudice based on race, creed, or national origin.

I SHALL CONDEMN any dishonest or unethical practice which tends to corrupt or undermine our American system of free elections or which hampers or prevents the full and free expression of the will of the voters.

I SHALL IMMEDIATELY AND PUBLICLY REPUDIATE support deriving from any individual or group which resorts, on behalf of my candidacy or in opposition to that of my opponent, to the methods and tactics which I condemn.

I, the undersigned, candidate for election to public office in the United States of America, hereby endorse, subscribe to, and solemnly pledge myself to conduct my campaign in accordance with the above principles and practices, so help me God.

Date _____ Signature _____

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABC'S OF SCAPEGOATING
Gordon W. Allport
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Freedom Pamphlet, 1963

AMERICAN CATHOLICS — A Protestant-Jewish View
Barr, Brown, Cohen, Gilbert, Marty, Robinson, Weigel
New York, Sheed & Ward, 1959

AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM AND SOCIAL ISSUES 1919-1939
Robert Moats Miller
Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1958

A CATHOLIC RUNS FOR PRESIDENT — The Campaign of 1928
Edmund A. Moore
New York, The Roland Press Company, 1956

CHRISTIANS AND THE STATE
John C. Bennett
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958

CROSS-CURRENTS
Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein
New York, Doubleday, 1956

FAIR PLAY IN POLITICS
New York, Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc., 1962

HISTORY OF BIGOTRY
Gustavus Meyers
New York, Random House, 1947, and Capricorn Books (Putnam paperback), 1960

THE MAKING OF THE PRESIDENT 1960
Theodore H. White
New York, Atheneum, 1961

A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS
John F. Kennedy
New York, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, The One Nation Library, 1963

ORDEAL OF THE PRESIDENCY
David Cushman Coyle
Washington, Public Affairs Press, 1960

OUR OWN KIND — Voting by Race, Creed or National Origin
Moses Rischin
Santa Barbara, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1960

PATHS TO THE NEW WORLD: American Immigration — Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow
Edward Corsi
New York, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Freedom Book, 1956

THE PROTESTANT AND POLITICS
William Lee Miller
Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1958

PROTESTANT-CATHOLIC-JEW
Will Herberg
New York, Doubleday, 1955

RELIGION AND THE PRESIDENCY
Edward J. Richter and Berton Dulce
New York, Macmillan, 1962

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND THE PRESIDENCY
Patricia Barrett
New York, Herder & Herder, 1963

"SOME OF MY BEST FRIENDS . . ."
Benjamin R. Epstein and Arnold Forster
New York, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1962

STATE-BY-STATE STUDY OF SMEAR
New York, Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc., 1958, 1960, 1962